

CPAR QUALITY CHECKLIST**Last Updated: 13 August 02**

This checklist is to be used as a guide to help CPARS users improve the quality of CPAR information. In part, this checklist was developed with input from source selection officials who have indicated that improvements in the quality of CPARs is needed to make the information more valuable during the source selection process. This checklist is based on current guidance and incorporates lessons learned. CPARS information must be accurate and the accompanying narratives must allow a reader, who may not have personal knowledge of the program, to gain a complete understanding of the contractor's performance.

Name: _____
 Contract No: _____

Date: _____
 Order No: _____

CHECK	A) REGISTERED INFORMATION IS ACCURATE AND COMPLETE	REMARKS
<input type="checkbox"/>	1) Perform an independent check of the CAGE, DUNS, FSC, and NAICS to assure accuracy. Use the "LOOKUPS" provided in CPARS to verify accuracy of these key fields. Contact your contracting officer to assist with these codes if you still have questions.	Incorrect information may result in CPARs not being retrieved by source selection evaluators when accessing PPIRS. Also, an incorrect CAGE code could result in unauthorized access to another company's CPAR information.
<input type="checkbox"/>	2) Ensure that the Contracting Officer, Award Dollar Value and Contract Completion Date blocks are kept <u>updated</u> .	Allows future readers to identify a valid point-of-contact, help establish relevancy and recency.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3) Provide a comprehensive "Contract Effort Description," Block 17, and spell out all acronyms. Sample block 17	This information is very important to source selection evaluators when assessing relevancy.
<input type="checkbox"/>	4) In Block 6, "Location of Contract Performance," provide geographic location(s), if different from Block 1, where the work is actually being performed	Important to future readers when extreme weather conditions are applicable.
	B) NARRATIVE IS COMPREHENSIVE/ CONSISTENT	REMARKS
<input type="checkbox"/>	1) Spell out first occurrence of <u>all</u> acronyms in narrative fields.	Allows future readers to understand program specifics.
<input type="checkbox"/>	2) Verify that ratings are consistent with the CPAR ratings definitions. A suggested approach is to write the narrative first then use the CPAR ratings definitions to provide a rating (Excellent, Very Good, etc).	The definitions will minimize variation between commands and services. Contractors have asked the government to be consistent in the rating process.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3) Ratings are consistent with the narrative. Do not state "excellent job" if assigning a "very good," or "satisfactory rating."	Inconsistent ratings/narrative will confuse the contractor and the source selection evaluators.
<input type="checkbox"/>	4) Writer backs up all ratings with fully detailed narrative. Do not just state "contractor was exceptional." Do state what was accomplished that exceeded requirements and how it benefited the Government, i.e. Provide solid examples of the contractor's work to support ratings. The narrative must tell the whole story and be supported by objective data. Sample of insufficient and sufficient narrative for "Exceptional" rating	The narrative is the most critical aspect of the CPAR assessment. As you are writing the report, you should remind yourself who the final audience is for the CPAR. Source selection evaluators rely on the narrative, not the ratings, when evaluating past performance and assessing the level of risk.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5) Narratives do not include statements that could result in an "Equitable Adjustment" to the contract. For example, do not include phrases that state the contractor performed work "out-of-scope" or "outside-the-scope of the contract."	This implies that the contractor performed work not legally required. An equitable adjustment means that the program office will have to come up with additional funds to pay for the additional tasks.

<input type="checkbox"/>	6) In section 18 of the CPAR, each rated area requires a narrative. "Satisfactory" ratings still require a description of the contractor's performance. The narrative should explain instances where it is not possible for the contractor to achieve greater than a "satisfactory" rating. Sample of "Satisfactory" narrative	
<input type="checkbox"/>	7) Resolution of previous and current problems is well explained and documented. Sample of the narrative	
<input type="checkbox"/>	8) Ratings and narratives are consistent with other program metrics including award fees, cost performance reports, Earned Value Management Data, and IPARS.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	9) Large shifts in ratings are well supported with objective data.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	10) Narrative does not include personal statements such as, "the contractor will lose business if poor performance continues."	
<input type="checkbox"/>	11) Narrative does not tell the contractor how to resolve their problems. For example, "the contractor needs to hire more people to meet schedule."	Need to avoid inadvertent Constructive Changes that might result in charges to the Government.
<input type="checkbox"/>	12) Ratings are consistent with Block 20 recommendation, "Given what I know today about the contractor's ability to execute what he promised in his proposal, I (<i>definitely would not, probably would not, might or might not, probably would or definitely would</i>) award to him today given that I had a choice." For example, do not state "definitely would award" if there is a Marginal/Yellow rating.	Carefully double-check the statement to ensure that an incorrect recommendation was not inadvertently selected.
<input type="checkbox"/>	13) CPAR reports need to reflect an integrated assessment from all users of the contract. Contact the entire program team (including CORs, PCO, Finance, Logistics, etc.) including your customers for input.	No single office or organization should independently determine a performance assessment.
	C) CONTRACTOR RECEIVES PROPER NOTIFICATION AND COMPLETE REVIEW OF ANY COMMENTS.	REMARKS
<input type="checkbox"/>	1) Ensure contractor is properly notified of the CPAR and receives 30 days to comment.	There's no substitute for a personal touch. Do not rely solely on the automated email notification feature. Communicating with the contractor will allow the government to be aware when new personnel are involved.
<input type="checkbox"/>	2) If no comments received, Reviewing Official states in Block 24, the date(s) the contractor was notified, method used to notify, and by whom. For example, "Contractor was notified by the Focal Point on 03/01/xx via phone message and on 03/21/xx via email. No comments were received."	This will document that the Government took reasonable steps to notify the contractor.
	3) The Reviewing Official should address any exceptions noted by the contractor.	Take time to acknowledge the contractor's concerns. Addressing these will help source selection evaluators understand both views.

Hints for better reports:

- Be sure the contractor understands the areas to be evaluated—before work begins.
- Contractor and all evaluators shall have a copy of the CPARS Guide.
 - Provide at post-award conference if new contract award.
 - Provide prior to annual evaluation meeting if an existing contract.
 - Review key areas including rating definitions.
- Areas to be evaluated may change based on scope changes or different mission emphasis.
- Communicate, communicate, and communicate...
 - Don't wait until the annual evaluation to make the contractor aware of their performance.
 - Continuous communication gives the contractor the opportunity to make corrections and should ultimately result in improved performance for the Government.
 - Contractor performance should NOT be a mystery to the contractor!
- Document, document, and document...
 - CPAR is done annually, BUT need to document performance regularly (e.g., monthly Certificate of Service, semi-annual award fee, etc.) to ensure accurate and complete information is available at the end of the evaluation period. Supporting documentation also helps follow-on evaluators in the event of personnel turnover.

SAMPLE: Block 17. Contract Effort Description [BACK](#)

“The contractor is to provide DOD-oriented professional level engineering and technical support in executing analytical studies and/or experimental investigations involving vulnerability and hardening of ship and submarine structures and equipment subjected to conventional or nuclear weapons effects, above or under water. Task efforts range from routine application of vulnerability assessment and hardening design methods to development and application of state-of-the-art damage prediction algorithms and analysis methods to evaluate ship and submarine systems response to weapons loads. This includes development of improved vulnerability assessment computer codes, application to evaluate new ship designs against postulated threats, and formulation of hardening options to enhance ship survivability. Design and testing of ship hardening concepts and prototype passive protection systems are also included.”

Block 17 Instructions:

Provide a complete description of the contract effort that identifies key technologies, components, subsystems, and requirements. This section is of critical importance to future Performance Risk Assessment Groups (PRAGs) and source selection authorities. The description should be detailed enough to assist a future PRAG in determining the relevancy of this program to their source selection. Also, keep in mind that users of this information may not understand program jargon. It is important to address the complexity of the contract effort and the overall technical risk associated with accomplishing the effort. For intermediate CPARs, a brief description of key milestone events that occurred in the review period may be beneficial (e.g., critical design review (CDR), functional configuration audit (FCA)), as well as, major contract modifications during the period. For task/delivery order contracts, state the number of tasks issued during the period, tasks completed during the period, and tasks which remain active. For contracts, which include multiple functional disciplines or activities, categories should be designated to: (1) reflect the full scope of the contract, and (2) allow grouping similar work efforts within the categories to avoid unnecessary segregation of essentially similar specialties or activities. Each category or area should be separately numbered, titled and described within Block 17 to facilitate cross-referencing with the evaluation of the contractor's performance within each category in Blocks 18 and 19.

Sample insufficient narrative: [BACK](#)

“Business Relations. Contractor has exhibited excellent business relations with all customers during this reporting period. The contractor has a positive history of reasonable and cooperative behavior with this office. They have assessed the proposal submittals and initiated corrective action plans in an adequate manner. The integration and coordination activities that the contractor has taken to execute the contract have been excellent. All deliverables have been on time.”

The example above clearly conveys that the Government was very pleased with the contractor’s performance. However, it fails to provide specific examples of performance or if there were a single or multiple significant events of benefit to the Gov’t so would be of limited direct use in a source selection. This narrative also failed to mention how the Contractor did in small business goals attainment.

A better way to write this might be...

“Business Relations. Contractor has exhibited excellent business relations with all customers during this reporting period—this is evident in its communications with Government personnel, its own employees and its vendors/subcontractors. This is, in part, due to the contractor instituting a monthly team meeting between all Evaluators of the mission team. In addition to the monthly team meeting, the Contractor implemented semi-monthly working group meetings at the functional levels which has garnered an exchange of information which has been of benefit to the Government in allowing issues to be discussed and resolved at the functional level. As a result, the Government has seen quicker notification of issues and resolution of problems. The contractor has a positive history of reasonable and cooperative behavior with this office. They have assessed the proposal submittals (23 submittals in 12 months) and initiated corrective action plans (within seven days of receipt) in an adequate manner. The integration and coordination activities that the

contractor has taken to execute the contract have been excellent. All (17) deliverables have been on time— with no need for re-work or clarification which has allowed the Government to distribute to their users in a timely fashion thereby meeting the mission needs. During this evaluation period, the Contractor met all of its small business subcontracting goals and through its aggressive market research, was able to locate two HUBZone and Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Businesses to provide technical support in an area with historically limited small business sources.”

SAMPLE “SATISFACTORY” RATING NARRATIVE: [BACK](#)

“20. QUALITY OF PRODUCT OR SERVICE: This contract is for the collection of refuse at _____ Air Force Base located near Anytown, USA. As part of its services, COMPANY A is required to pick up 87 dumpsters across an approximate 30 square mile area, 12 hazardous waste containers and 7 bio-hazardous waste material containers at the Medical Clinic located on the base. Given the nature of the services performed for this contract and the schedule for refuse collection, it would be difficult to obtain above a Satisfactory for performance on this contract. During this evaluation period, COMPANY A met all of its refuse collection requirements, on time as stated in the contract. Further, COMPANY A ensured that all of the tops of the dumpsters were closed after dumping to ensure that no foreign object debris (FOD) entered the flight line area despite the locale being in an area prone to high winds. Further, there were no incidents of improper storage or disposal of the hazardous waste or bio-hazardous waste material during this reporting period. Therefore, the rating of Satisfactory indicates performance within the requirements of the contract and that there were no problems encountered during this reporting period with COMPANY A. “

RESOLUTION OF PREVIOUS AND CURRENT PROBLEMS [BACK](#)

XYZ Services received a Very Good rating for 'Cost Control.' While the contractor aggressively managed site supplies and equipment and continually looked for ways to reduce costs and avoid expenses, during the onset of this evaluation period, the contractor failed to identify items in the warehouse which could have been disposed of through Defense Reutilization Marketing Offices. This oversight resulted in additional funds being expended (\$27,000) for warehouse storage fees. This problem was identified in a random property audit and although the additional storage funds had already been expended, the contractor worked over the weekend to ensure the items were ready for disposal by the following week. The contractor has since initiated its own audit/self-inspection schedule and inventory control log to alleviate this problem from recurring. In other areas, the contractor maintains tight controls and dynamic management in civil engineering, logistics and technical operations reaped numerous cost savings/benefits. In March 2000, the contractor repaired three analog to digital circuit cards, returning \$73,000 in critical assets to the Air Force and reduced bench stock from 1,415 line items to 265 line items resulting in a cost savings of \$125,000 with no degradation of equipment status. At _____ AFB, Colorado, the contractor saved approximately \$10,000 in depot level repairs through its initiation of a rapid turn-around stock program. Hydraulic and pneumatic replacement tool spares are now being kept in inventory for immediate use while the damaged tools are in repair. This ensures availability of all necessary tools for the quick turn-around repairs. While the contractor experienced some initial problems in its property and inventory control which resulted in additional funds expenditures, their quick remedies and mitigation plan for the future have greatly benefited the Government, especially given the tight funding environment.